

**In the Drawings**

A replacement sheet 6/6 is provided herein to correct Figs 4A-4D.

## **REMARKS**

In view of the preceding amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

### **Amendments to the Specification and Drawings**

While the Office Action made no mention of them, the Applicant discovered several element numbering errors and grammatical problems with Figs. 4A-4D and the text in the Specification describing them. In particular, errors in numbering and inconsistencies were discovered on pages 7 and 8 of the Specification. Therefore, changes to both the Drawing sheet 6/6 and Specification pages 7 and 8 are proposed here so the Drawings and Specification read right and are consistent with one another.

In Fig. 4A, "200" is changed to --210--, "s300-1" and "s300-2" are changed to --s310-1-- and --s310-2--. Bridge flex circuit 210 in Fig. 4A is now numbered consistently with the same piece in Fig. 1 and 2, and represents others of 210-216.

In Fig. 4B, "300-1" and "300-2" are changed to --c310-1-- and --c310-2--.

In Fig. 4C, "202" is changed to --212--, "s302-1" and "s302-2" are changed to --s312-1-- and --s312-2--. Bridge flex circuit 212 in Fig. 4C is now numbered consistently with the same piece in Fig. 1 and 2, and represents others of 210-216. The cleavage line "330" is changed to --332--.

In Fig. 4D, "302-1" and "302-2" are changed to --c312-1-- and --c312-2--. The cleavage line "330" for bridge flex circuit 212 is changed to --332--.

A redline markup of Figs. 4A-4D is included, along with a clean copy of the replacement sheet 6/6 for them.

### **Response to Claims Rejections**

Claims 1-22 were pending in the Application. Claims 13-14 were allowed, and Claims 1-12 and 15-22 were rejected. By this Response, Claims 1-12 and 15-22 are canceled, and Claims 23 and 24 are added. No new matter is added by these amendments.

Claim 3 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) and has been canceled.

Claims 1-12 and 15-22 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for a variety of reasons. The original claims were apparently hard to follow, the Office Action admitted, "Due to the fact that the scope of claims 5-10, and 15-22 are not ascertained as mentioned in the 112, 2nd rejection, these claims have not been treated based on prior art."

Such Claims have been canceled in favor of the more precise and clear recitations of Claims 23 and 24. Claim 4 was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form, and such is being submitted here as Claim 24. With the number of changes needed to respond to the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections related to Claim 1 and 4, it seemed best to just cancel Claim 4 and start fresh with Claim 24.

Claims 1-3 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Morris (US 5,978,752). Morris is very different than the present invention. Its Abstract says it is a system and method to validate a model used in implementing a model-based servo controller in a disc drive. A nominal model is first constructed. The nominal model is augmented with an uncertainty description to characterize variations in drives to be manufactured. The model is constrained by performance objectives. Weights corresponding to the uncertainty description and performance objectives are adjusted based on a comparison between a  $\mu$  matrix function and a  $\mu_{sub.g}$  matrix function until a desired performance level is achieved while maintaining stability in a desired frequency range.

The claimed present invention is related to a particular construction of a main flex circuit and several bridge flex circuits that are used in a voice coil actuator with multiple sliders and micro-actuators in a disk drive. The inarticulate way original Claims 1-12 and 15-22 recited the intended subject matter allowed art like Morris to seemingly be relevant. The Office Action pointed to Fig. 4 in Morris as teaching a circuit flex interface assembly providing a micro-actuator control bundle. However, Fig. 4 of Morris actually shows no flex circuit at all, and really no longer reads on Claims 23 and 24. Microactuator controller(s) 174 are described in the Detailed Description as "optional". The only mention in Morris of a flex circuit occurs in the short paragraph that reads, "6. Non-linearity due to flex circuit bias forces on the actuator....In other words, the actuator is coupled to the disc drive controller through a flex circuit....When the actuator positions the transducer at different radial positions on the disc, the flex circuit bias forces on the actuator can change." So Morris hardly anticipates or makes obvious the claimed present invention.

The rejections of Claims 1-12 and 15-22 are moot in view of their cancelation.

Claims 13 and 14 were indicated as allowable, so those claims are left as original here.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending application, with pending Claims 1-22, is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite matters, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned below.

Very respectfully submitted,

Gregory Scott Smith  
GSS Law Group  
3900 Newpark Mall Rd  
Third Floor, Suite 317  
Newark, CA 94560

Reg. No. 38,309  
Phone (510) 742-7417  
Fax (510) 742-7419

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Signature



Evanjin M. Dasalla

Date: October 26, 2006

REDLINE

[illegible]

**Fig. 4B.**

**Fig. 4A**

Fig. 4C

**Fig. 4D**